

United States Patent and Trademark Office

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.	
10/721,406	11/24/2003	Martti Y.O. Kangas	11240 8038		
208	7590 07/27/2006		EXAMINER		
WALTER A. RODGERS			HALPERN, MARK		
RODGERS & RODGERS 6100 LAKE FORREST DRIVE			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER	
SUITE 340			1731		
ATLANTA,	GA 30328		DATE MAILED: 07/27/2006		

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

|--|

Application No.	Applicant(s)		
10/721,406	KANGAS ET AL.		
Examiner	Art Unit		
Mark Halpern	1731		

Advisory Action	10/721,406 KANGAS ET AL.				
Before the Filing of an Appeal Brief	Examiner	Art Unit			
	Mark Halpern	1731			
The MAILING DATE of this communication appe	ars on the cover sheet with the d	orrespondence add	ress		
THE REPLY FILED 17 July 2006 FAILS TO PLACE THIS APPI	LICATION IN CONDITION FOR AL	LOWANCE.			
1. The reply was filed after a final rejection, but prior to or or this application, applicant must timely file one of the follow places the application in condition for allowance; (2) a Not a Request for Continued Examination (RCE) in compliant time periods:	the same day as filing a Notice of wing replies: (1) an amendment, aff tice of Appeal (with appeal fee) in one ce with 37 CFR 1.114. The reply mo	Appeal. To avoid aba idavit, or other eviden compliance with 37 Cf	ce, which FR 41.31; or (3)		
a) The period for reply expiresmonths from the mailing b) The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this A no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire I	Advisory Action, or (2) the date set forth ater than SIX MONTHS from the mailing	g date of the final rejection	on.		
Examiner Note: If box 1 is checked, check either box (a) or TWO MONTHS OF THE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP 7		E FIRST REPLY WAS FI	LED WITHIN		
Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The date have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of ex under 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the set forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b) NOTICE OF APPEAL	tension and the corresponding amount shortened statutory period for reply orig r than three months after the mailing da	of the fee. The appropri- inally set in the final Offic te of the final rejection, e	ate extension fee ce action; or (2) as even if timely filed,		
 The Notice of Appeal was filed on A brief in comp filing the Notice of Appeal (37 CFR 41.37(a)), or any exte a Notice of Appeal has been filed, any reply must be filed AMENDMENTS 	nsion thereof (37 CFR 41.37(e)), to	avoid dismissal of the	s of the date of e appeal. Since		
3. The proposed amendment(s) filed after a final rejection, (a) They raise new issues that would require further co (b) They raise the issue of new matter (see NOTE below	nsideration and/or search (see NO` w);	TE below);			
(c) ☐ They are not deemed to place the application in being appeal; and/or	tter form for appeal by materially re	ducing or simplifying t	he issues for		
(d) They present additional claims without canceling a NOTE: (See 37 CFR 1.116 and 41.33(a)).		ected claims.			
4. The amendments are not in compliance with 37 CFR 1.1		mpliant Amendment (PTOL-324).		
5. Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s)					
 Newly proposed or amended claim(s) would be all non-allowable claim(s). 	llowable if submitted in a separate,	timely filed amendme	nt canceling the		
7. For purposes of appeal, the proposed amendment(s): a) how the new or amended claims would be rejected is protected. The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows:		ll be entered and an e	xplanation of		
Claim(s) allowed: Claim(s) objected to:					
Claim(s) rejected: <u>10-19</u> . Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration:					
AFFIDAVIT OR OTHER EVIDENCE					
8. The affidavit or other evidence filed after a final action, but because applicant failed to provide a showing of good answas not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 1.116(e).	It before or on the date of filing a No d sufficient reasons why the affidav	otice of Appeal will <u>no</u> it or other evidence is	t be entered necessary and		
9. The affidavit or other evidence filed after the date of filing entered because the affidavit or other evidence failed to of showing a good and sufficient reasons why it is necessary	overcome <u>all</u> rejections under appea y and was not earlier presented. S	al and/or appellant fail ee 37 CFR 41.33(d)(1	ls to provide a).		
10. The affidavit or other evidence is entered. An explanatio REQUEST FOR RECONSIDERATION/OTHER		•			
11. The request for reconsideration has been considered bu See Continuation Sheet.			ce because:		
12. Note the attached Information Disclosure Statement(s). (PTO/SB/08 or PTO-1449) Paper No(s) 13. Other:					
		M. Halx			
		Mark Halpern Primary Examiner)		

Continuation of 5. Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s): Claims 10-19 rejection under the judicially created doctrine of obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claims 1-8, of U.S. Patent No. 6,866,207, is withdrawn. Terminal Disclaimer received 17 July 2006 is approved.

Continuation of 11. does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: The Applicants Response was reviewed. Claims 10, 17-19, rejection under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Shortridge, is proper. Claims 11-16, rejection under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Shortridge, is proper. Claims 10, 17-19, rejection under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Zapp, is proper.

Claims 11-16, rejection under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Zapp, is proper.

In response to Applicants allegation that the cited prior art does not disclose paper, paper is not claimed. The present claims are apparatus claims.

In response to Applicants allegation that coating colors solids must be high to reduce the cost of drying, this aspect is not claimed. In response to Applicants allegation that paper machine speeds are high, this aspect is not claimed

In response to Applicants allegation that CD profile control is a must, this aspect was not claimed